



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PRESENT TENDENCIES IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Philadelphia Divinity School

Twenty-five years ago in this country the so-called higher criticism was just beginning to filter down into the rank and file of the students of the Hebrew Bible. The name was known only to be feared by the mass of Bible readers. The Pentateuch was still the battle-field in the eyes of the world: even scholarship had not yet awakened to the catastrophic results which must logically affect the whole range of the study of Old Testament Scriptures and religion. The "Wellhausen theory"—so called because that magnificent scholar became the protagonist of the cause through the brilliance of his arguments—was still in dispute, namely as to the point for which his name especially stands, the late, post-exilic composition of the Priest Code, which the first pentateuchal critics had regarded as the backbone and so the earliest element of the five books of Moses. The new archaeology, quickened from Babylonia, had not made its way down into the rank and file of students. It was not so long before that the elder Semitists looked with suspicion upon the claims of the new science, and apart from some outstanding specimens of Babylonian literature, like the Flood and Creation stories, the principal contribution of Assyriology to biblical science lay in the historical field, the texts which gave the names and deeds of the oriental monarchs who had touched

the fortunes of Israel. On this side the archaeology of Mesopotamia was claimed by the conservatives as of apologetic value. As for the other oriental realms, the results of Egyptology had been exploited, leaving, however, a sense of disappointment in their application to Israel; William Wright had but a few years before published his prophetic work, *The Empire of the Hittites* (1884), which was received with incredulity; South Arabia had not yet been really opened up; Cretan archaeology, indeed the vast implications of the Mediterranean world, unearthed first by Schliemann, were not suspected by the most daring. As for exegesis, we had the commentaries of superb scholars, like Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, masters in the philology and criticism of their day, but who were before the time when archaeology should play the chief rôle and literary criticism should become one of the chief trial factors for criticizing the text of the prophets and poets, while the articulation of Israel's religion into the close-knit fabric of ancient faith and myth had not yet been attempted by the later science of comparative religion. A commentary of a quarter of a century ago was a rich mosaic of precious fragments of learning, but with no discernible pattern: there were still missing the solvents which should analyze and combine and present in their proper proportions and relations

the twisted threads of history and literature.

Such was the state of things, at least in the reminiscences of the writer, twenty-five years ago. I do not mean that the men higher up did not see farther, but only that they were not so sure of results that they could make their light shine down into the profane world. But coming down into a briefer span of time, let us say the past fifteen years, anyone whose critical studies go back for a quarter of a century must feel amazed at the amount of rich fructification that has burst forth in this limited time, all of it founded on the labors of the past, but coming to maturity all at once under the conjunction of many happy influences. There is first of all archaeology, the many bits of whose discoveries have been slowly pieced together, until all at once, as in a picture puzzle, the meaning of a large aggregation suddenly flashes on the mind's eye. There is the larger and deeper appreciation of ancient man, derived both from the study of the primitive races and also from more intelligent appreciation of the ancient literatures like that of Greece, whereby we learn that man then as now, it is to be assumed, thought and spoke simply and clearly within his limited range of ideas; with the application of this principle we have knocked down the barriers of many a corrupt text, have come, with patience, to understand many a phrase or book which formerly appeared only a pious riddle. There has arisen the realization that the study of the texts does not mean a haphazard comparison of manuscripts and versions, but entails an applied and accurate

analysis of the materials which may constitute a lifework. In the fierce competition of scholarship it has been discovered that there exists a deep aesthetic character in the Old Testament which requires something more than Philology and the critical scalpel. And then and latest of all there is the accumulation of facts and theories in the study of comparative religion which gives us a place to stand in our judgment of the Old Testament religion, a point which must be continually shifting with the growth of fresh knowledge, so that the young science may not take conceit to itself, although its attempt to explain Israel's religion must be regarded as perfectly reasonable, even if in its investigations it halts before the inscrutable mysteries of the human heart and experience, just as our physics rises to measure the stars but is unable to fathom the eternal depths beyond.

The New Situation in General

Probably the most important feature of the present stage of Old Testament study is that it has been weaned from its old status of a purely theological discipline, necessary for theologians and seminarians alone. Israel's history is found to be part and parcel of the history of the world: the archaeologist, the student of religion, the literary critic has discovered that here is a rich mine of fact and comparison for his own field of labor, and many an outsider has attacked Old Testament problems with his tools and theories to produce results which shame the specialist, while the Old Testament student himself has learned that he may think nothing human alien to himself. He cannot

bask in the Hebrew as "the speech which angels love," he ought to know the gamut of the Semitic languages; he may not be satisfied with the Hebrew text of the Bible, he must explore the recesses of versions of half a dozen different tongues; the history of Israel is not that of Abraham's family developing in a land from which the hornet had happily exterminated every Canaanite, he has to do with a Babel of races and influences; the very religion itself now must be studied under the light of facts from Egypt and Arabia and Babylonia, from Crete and Greece and the Hittites. And in judgment upon the theologian sits the specialist in similar fields beyond who calls him to account for every prejudice and stupid convention of thought. He has to make a science of his subject and articulate it in the science of mankind.

May I be pardoned if I write as though I thought none or few of my readers were conversant with what I speak of? But it means no disrespect to say that probably many intelligent men think that the word "criticism" still means some such thing as once was presented to us under the term "higher criticism," consisting in a very arid division of the text of the Bible into so many different sources, a J and E and P, which position many may have adopted as the complete solution and still stay there, as if there was nothing beyond Wellhausen, while others rejecting that prosiac theory, abhorrent or uninteresting to orthodox or imaginative minds, have been content to remain behind on the older position that "the old Bible is good enough for me." But we may assure ourselves that no

such static condition obtains in present-day Old Testament science; the inroad of new facts and theories has thrown all into a most fascinating and perplexing flux. Wellhausen—I use the name typically—no longer stands in the center of the field, though that school has always to be reckoned with. But there are all sorts of new schools abroad to which the older criticism is a commonplace or an archaism, each making the most of its own choice of facts, each jostling the other. I doubt if anywhere there is more confusion, but the present is the most pregnant age in the whole history of Old Testament criticism. Nothing is finished, we are just beginning! There is plenty for everyone to learn and discover, if he keep an open eye and advance with all the scientific training he can bring to bear from whatever quarter.

The Philological Study of Hebrew

In summarizing the manifold activities of Old Testament science, I may only briefly refer to the stimulus given to Hebrew study by the rapid and enormous publication of Assyriological literature, which is assuming a capital interest in Semitic philology much like that which Arabic has hitherto enjoyed. It requires no effort of thought to understand the possibilities for Hebrew study which lie in the language of Babylonia, whose literature is millenniums older than the Bible dialect, and which was the imperial language of southwest Asia. South Arabian archaeology has also opened up a limited but rich mine of philological research. I may refer here briefly to Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. Three dictionaries attest the activities of scholarship in this line:

the so-called *Oxford Dictionary*, edited by Professors Brown and Briggs of Union Seminary and Professor Driver of Oxford; the last edition of the classical Gesenius in German; and yet another by König. And it is to be noticed that the mere study of words still constitutes the substance of many learned treatises and is a necessary basis of every scientific work on the Old Testament.

The Status of Text-Criticism

From philology we pass naturally to the study of the Hebrew text: despite all the labor expended here from the days of the scribes early in our era and of Origen, greatest of Christian scholars, down through the disputes of Protestant and Catholic theologians and the labors of Kennicott and De Rossi, we feel that the work is still only in its inception according to the demand of modern scientific criticism. No such impetus has come to our aid as in the New Testament field, some of whose oldest codices have only been discovered, others for the first time evaluated, within a few decades. No ancient Hebrew texts have been discovered; we still must rely upon manuscripts of the end of the first Christian millennium, although the discovery of two-thirds of the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus and of a third of the Greek of the Book of Enoch, from which the Ethiopic was translated, keeps us hopeful for textual finds. But at present we are thrown back upon the slow and uncertain process of comparison with the ancient versions, primarily the Greek. Here a work even more laborious than that of New Testament textual criticism must

be instituted to discover the genealogical relations of the Greek manuscripts and of the daughter versions; and only when this has been accomplished can we surely proceed to the criticism of the Hebrew text. We have been slow at the work; a start has been made in the collation of the Greek texts in the Cambridge Septuagint edited by Brooke and McLean of which only three fasciculi, covering Genesis to Deuteronomy, have appeared. The Göttingen Academy has instituted a grand undertaking in the field of Septuagintal study and is publishing a series of monographs as prolegomena to the plan. Many sober scholars feel that much of the higher criticism has too rashly gone ahead of the settlement of the text, and decry the easy and ready methods with which the German scholars, especially, handle the text to suit their exegesis. Of course, textual criticism is temperamentally conservative—we may compare the opposition of the English and German schools in New Testament criticism, the former insisting on the textual, the other somewhat impatiently straining after more striking results, although I conceive that now Germany is snatching the laurels from the brows of the English lower critics. An extreme instance of the part which Septuagintal criticism may play or be made to play is seen in the rather noisy work of Mr. Wiener, who from this standpoint has been virulently attacking the Wellhausen school in a series of articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, also appearing in two volumes, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism: The Coup de Grâce to the Wellhausen Critics*, and *The Origin of the Pentateuch: A Complete Answer to the Wellhausen Critics*. It

may be worth while to say that he argues from the disagreement of the Greek with the Hebrew in the use of the divine names in the Pentateuch to the fallacy of arguing from these names to the discrimination of sources. But the argument is itself fallacious, for the higher critic by no means depends upon this criterion, which is rather of historical importance as having first given the impetus to the theory of sources. But this aggressive attack on the prevailing school may be worth noticing to show that positions, however approved and accepted as orthodox, will require continual re-statement, and that a mere orthodoxy of criticism cannot maintain itself.

Opposition to the Wellhausen School by Radicals

Passing on now to the domain of higher criticism it may be curtly said that in the Pentateuchal field the so-called Wellhausen school on the whole holds the field victoriously, although as I shall later show, it is no longer the center of interest. The acceptance of those tenets is by no means a brand of intellectual or religious radicalism, as it once was: in Germany conservatives like Kautzsch, Kittel, König, in England men like Driver and Skinner, profess this school. In fact English and American scholarship is found almost entirely in the Wellhausen camp, outside of a few confessional strongholds.

However voices are heard from radical camps in opposition to this school of criticism. A Dutch scholar, Eerdmans, is publishing a series of books to prove the impracticability of the Wellhausen

source-theory, though it must be recognized, in order to establish another source-theory of his own, that the use of the word "Elohim" represents a polytheistic stratum—a result hardly consoling to the old-fashioned conservative.¹ But from another quarter there has appeared an aggressive and often contemptuously expressed criticism of the Wellhausenites. I refer to that younger school of Assyriologists called pan-Babylonists—nor do they refuse the title—who claim everything in sight for Babylon. They are impatient with the negative results of this higher criticism for historical study. When we have assigned the compiled sources to certain ages before or after the Exile, there still remains the question as to the historical value of their contents, however early or late composed in their present form. Sayce has pointed out that characteristic elements both of the Yahwist, the eldest source, and of the Priest Code, the youngest, are found equally in the Babylonian parallel to the biblical Flood story. According to the Priest Code alone Abraham's family came from Ur of the Chaldees in Southern Babylonia; the higher critic dismisses the story as a late fabrication, although not by logical necessity. But the Babylonist sees in it a historical illustration of the movement of the Semitic races about 2000 B.C., and claims Abraham as the evangelist to the westland of the esoteric monotheism, which, he asserts, had its rise in the Babylonian schools back toward 3000 B.C. A fascinating presentation of this school's theories can now be had in English translation in

¹An article soon to appear in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* from the hand of Professor Schmidt, of Cornell, will illustrate this phase of criticism.

Jeremias' *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Orient*.¹

The Analysis of J, E, and P

This school, opinionated and arbitrary as it is, with almost a cult of its own, rejected by soberer scholars for the lack of proof for its stupendous claims, is nevertheless again a healthy leaven to forestall any settling of the lees on the part of the higher criticism. Of more solid importance, however, is the criticism which, stacking on the Wellhausen hypothesis, is criticizing the contents of the several sources of the Pentateuch. J, E, and P, the symbols of the several strata, are no longer found adequate; each of them is to be subdivided into so many hands or cycles of tradition, or even fragments. In the first eleven chapters of Genesis Budde distinguishes three or four J's. This internal criticism is leading us back to early strata of literature and legend, and the elder tendency of criticism to bring down the dates of the sources is being reversed in favor of early dates for the sub-sources. The traditional extreme of the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch will never be reached again, but criticism, instead of pulling down, now thinks it will be able to recover fragments of literature or saga which go back to the Mosaic age. Of course this process with its eructation of many hands is exposed to the danger of very a priori opinion, and there arises the impression that the higher criticism is going bankrupt, in somewhat the same way that we must feel in the matter of the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels. When in either field will the process ever

stop and come to certainty? Still, it is better to know the uncertainty of one's position than to be confident on shifting sands. In this connection I may point to the *Polychrome Bible*, edited in this country, as an undertaking on a large scale to present the results of source criticism; the work remains unfinished for lack of funds.

The Case of the Prophetic Books

But the Pentateuch is no longer the sole field of the higher criticism. The analysis has been carried on rigorously through the historical books, but its field of special activity just now is the Prophets. At this point—I must speak summarily—there reigns entire confusion. With one school there prevails the theory that practically each prophetic book is a jumble of fragments from every quarter and that every passage must prove its title to authenticity. The absence of historical data in so large part of these prophetic books, and the marked contradictions of opinion as to the historical development of Israel's religion, invite every reconstructor of the prophets to the exploitation of the most subjective criticism. The radicals seem to know very well what the prophets could not have spoken, and eliminate huge sections; according to Duhm, only one-eighth of Jeremiah comes from the prophet of that name; according to Haupt only one chapter of Micah is authentic. Not only so but they rewrite the fragments that remain and assume to tell us what the prophets must have said. Examples of this literary recomposition of the Prophets can be seen *in extenso* in the work of the same

¹ Compare Toy's criticism of the school in *Harvard Theological Review*, III.

Baltimore scholar, Haupt, in numerous articles in American learned journals. The post-exilic hypothesis is especially active in this field; I am inclined to think that by far the major portion of the "pre-exilic" Prophets has been transferred by the radicals to the age after the Exile, and of this again a very large portion to the Maccabaean period. We have to recognize that the pentauchal critical principles are being applied to the Prophets; it is a stage of unrest and arbitrariness, upon which must follow a reaction; and indeed the reaction has already set in.

Metrical Criticism

Before I leave the internal criticism of the Old Testament I should notice one new species of analysis which has fast forged to the front in the past twenty years, the so-called metrical criticism, which, based on the recognition of the formally poetical character of a large part of the Testament, attempts to recover the original poetic form, to state its laws, and to revise the text where it appears to transgress the ascertained canons of meter. Some of the principles, especially the rhetorical characteristics of Hebrew prosody, were discovered by Bishop Lowth over one hundred and fifty years ago, but it has remained for scholars, many of whom are still alive, Briggs in this country, Budde and Duhm and others in Germany, to establish the principles of musical form. A capital little book of W. H. Cobb's, *Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre*, would serve as a good introduction. In this country we are most familiar with Briggs's essays in this direction, but while

he has been a pioneer of merit, his aesthetic powers have not been sufficient to make the cause appeal to English readers as it should. The more poetical German temperament has done the best work. One of the best essays in English in the reproduction in English form of the Hebrew poetry is found in Schmidt's *Messages of the Poets*.

The sense for this form of criticism and enjoyment of it are in the aesthetic perceptions, and ultimately we may look for a tremendous increase in the appreciation of the Old Testament when the layman shall have in his hands adequate poetical translations of the biblical poetical books. Further, this criticism is pregnant with exegetical value, for the canons of poetry are different from those of prose. Again, it possesses an objective, I might say a mechanical, value of very great importance, which is already being rigorously and drastically applied. The text is being rewritten to suit the assumed principles of prosody, and this critical art is being used as a reagent to test the higher critical problems of authorship. To give one example: Duhm rejects seven-eighths of Jeremiah on the ground of his asserted discovery that the prophet wrote only in a certain meter, the tetrameter. This is an extreme instance of the tendency, but the Prophets and Poets can never again be expounded without the fullest recognition of the claims of poetical criticism. Even such a book as Genesis is now claimed by Sievers, the most distinguished authority in the world on the science of metrics, as of clearly marked poetical structure; but his claim is not corroborated by the Hebraists.

The Progress of Archaeological Study of the Old Testament

I pass now to the tendencies induced by archaeology in Old Testament study. The rapid development in the decipherment and interpretation of the records of the ancient East has been the profoundest as well as the most striking influence upon this field for the past generation and more. It is important enough to demand a whole paper, not to be confined to a paragraph. But fortunately I can retrench on the subject because all intelligent students are familiar with the great outstanding results of archaeology. As to their inferences there still rages animated, even fierce, discussion, and I may not enter into the problems. Suffice it to say that we are not here presented with the simple dilemma often naively offered: Does archaeology prove or disprove the Bible, despite the zeal "not according to knowledge" of many writers of popular books? But in general it may be asserted that archaeology is exercising a sobering, conservative influence in biblical science. It offers outward, objective facts to counteract the necessarily subjective and largely uncontrolled judgment of literary documents from within, where hypotheses must be maintained for long without corresponding effective proof. Moreover the archaeologist is essentially of a constructive temperament, for he wishes to make as much as possible out of his scanty materials; on the other hand the literary critic is first of all analytical and too often feels that his work is done when he has torn to pieces. There are many

archaeologists who take little or no heed of the technical higher criticism, it is not congenial to their mental processes, they are too busily employed in displaying fresh facts to concern themselves over hackneyed discussions. This very application of a new unbiased objective criterion and of a different order of research is an infinite blessing to a science which was threatening to turn in upon itself and enter the stage of dry rot. Indeed it is psychologically interesting to observe how oppositely the same mind may work according as it operates in one or the other field. Thus Hugo Winckler,¹ the leader of the younger school of Assyriologists, has performed some of the most radical critical operations upon the Hebrew literature; but as archaeologist he stands forth as a costumer in the garb of history of much that was relegated to the dust heap of legend. To him Abraham is the evangelist in the westland of the Babylonian monotheism, Israel is a precipitate of the Babylonian culture, Jonah found a congenial field in preaching in Nineveh the doctrine of the one righteous God.

Others like Hommel have entered the fray under the aegis of archaeology, without any religious bias, and are girding with might and main at the, to them, comparatively unassured results of the higher criticism. At least our field is being attacked from a fresh and independent quarter, and the movement is salutary. We may compare the refreshment that has come to New Testament science at the hands of Blass and Ramsey and Deissmann.

¹This brilliant scholar died April 19, 1913, at the age of 50 years.

New Light on the Mosaic Age

I might signalize the effect of this archaeological quickening in that stage of the history which is always the most interesting, although perhaps not the most profitable, namely, the Mosaic age and the antecedent traditions. Two discoveries have entirely altered our outlook and comprehension of that early age: the Tell el-Amarna tablets (discovered in 1888, first publication in 1892), and the Code of Hammurabi (1899). The former documents have given us a picture of conditions in Palestine in the middle of the second millennium hardly excelled at any point by the Bible records: the latter an apprehension of the surprising ethical and juridical advance of Babylonian civilization in the age of Abraham. Many other items have fallen into the outlines of our skeleton picture, and it may be said that Moses has come to his own as the grand man of Israel's history, a veritable founder of a religion; that the Exodus is historical; that some of the codes in the second book of the Pentateuch may be essentially Mosaic, while the latest treatment, that of Gressmann's *Mose u. seine Zeit*, claims the Decalogue as Moses' work. Some rather radical scholars have been almost stumbling over themselves to establish identifications; Sinai is no longer a myth, although we must locate it, with the same name, in the volcanic region of northwest Arabia; Moses' reputed monotheism is nothing strange, he could have cribbed it from the Babylonian celestial monotheism or from the Egyptian Akenaten's attempt at a monotheistic reform—the first monotheist in history, as Breasted calls him. Now

observe that the way these results are worked out and a large part of the results will by no means satisfy the mere conservative, for sometimes they are very shocking. But if one compares Wellhausen's few words on the history of this period in his classic study of Israel's history in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* with the positive progress since made, he will recognize that there now exist a feeling of certainty and a will to construct which are new.

Of course we never know what to expect from the spade; it is best to keep from betting on this sport. The recent finds, since 1904, at Elephantine in Upper Egypt, exhibit to us about the end of the fifth century a very lively Jewish colony at that end of the earth, with its independent Yahweh temple, to which they are most loyally devoted, yet worshiping along with him two associate deities—a regular trinity; withal they maintain some kind of fellowship with the Jerusalem Jews. The principles of the Deuteronomic reform are blankly denied, yet withal we have in these papyri some most startling corroborations of many an assertion in Jewish history which had been regarded as apocryphal. It were well if we regarded archaeology with a sincere eye as the handmaid, not so much of religious orthodoxy or scientific prepossession, but of the truth.

The Religio-Historical School

There remains finally one development, the newest, the most promising, on which I may say but a few words, for lack of time and also for the difficulty of exposition. It is what the Germans

call the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, the school which applies the criteria used in the general investigation of tradition, legend, myth, religious rites, and beliefs, so as to discover the historical import of these things. It is a child of that science which is recovering, on the basis of archaeology and rites and myths, the history of ancient Greece and Rome. The school differs from that of the higher critics in professing the requirement of imagination. It is actuated by the same temperament as that inspiring work, Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to Greek Religion*, which so wonderfully revivifies and interprets the faith of the ancient Greeks. And even if her work or theirs proves fallacious, nevertheless they have given us a spur and a clue to the reconstruction of ancient history to which mere literary scalpels are never adequate.

The school is most catholic in its use of tools; it employs the whole of archaeology from whatsoever field, it is based on the higher criticism, does not hesitate to outdo the older criticism in its analysis of texts; without fear of its own rashness it ventures to analyze the different phases of Israel's traditions and thought, to peel them off layer by layer, so as to uncover the historical residuum, at the same time utilizing every layer as an exponent of the growth of the people's thought in the several ages.

This tendency has not yet infected the sober Anglo-Saxon genius; we must go to the Germans for it, although the Scot, Robertson Smith, is one of its forerunners. Leaving to one side the hap-hazard methods of the pan-Babylonists, I suppose that the protagonist of this school is Gunkel, with his *Commentary*

on *Genesis* (1901), now in the third edition, and the name suggests a delightful little book of his on the Psalms, in which he works out to most conservative results in chronology, in a field where it has become almost heterodox to allow pre-exilic compositions. The great historian of ancient universal history, Eduard Meyer, in his *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, has produced a very skeptical work, but one which shows how the trained student in legend and myth nevertheless knows how to find solid ground. And two books of Gressmann's are or will be peculiarly stimulating: *Der Ursprung d. israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905) and *Mose u. seine Zeit*, which has just appeared, and which promises to be epoch-making.

Let me speak of just two historical principles which such scholars as these are asserting. One is that saga, legend, even myth, are by no means empty to him who will see their historical contents. In his latest work Gressmann spends about two-thirds of the book in analyzing the legends about Moses, but he is confident that by the same process he can come to ultimate historic fact; for him myth is not a red herring laid across the trail but just the accretion of protecting bark which has arisen about the precious germ to hold it for future ages. And so he dares to give us a Moses *redivivus* and to recover the characteristics of his religion and work. The scholar who has gone farthest in the analysis of legend reaches a perfect confidence as to the object of his researches. For him the various phases of the literature of the folk-mind stand for ultimate facts which can be reached by scientific processes.

The other historic principle vindicated by this school is that we dare not think that an idea necessarily arose first with the first literary attestation of it. I may here refer to the other book of Gressmann's on Israelite eschatology. (The English reader can obtain some idea of his thought and methods in a paper of his entitled "Sources of Israel's Messianic Hope," in the *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1913.) He shows how the eschatological references of the prophets, instead of being brand new in origin, presuppose a long development of theological thought among the people; when they spoke of the Day of the Lord, or the Messiah, or of salvation, or a new heaven and a new earth, they were speaking to almost what we would call dogmas. And he buttresses his argument by appeal to similar ideas in the ancient religions of Egypt and Babylonia. He thus entirely reverses the tendency hitherto prevailing which would make Jewish eschatology a product of the post-exilic age, so that for instance the famous Messianic prophecies of Isaiah 9 and 11 must belong to the latest developments of Jewish thought, akin to the apocalypticism of

the second century. To give one example, he maintains that the *crux interpretum*, Isa. 7:14, the Immanuel passage, actually declares a wondrous birth, not unlikely the virginal conception, of a wondrous child, and this when exegetes had pretty well settled down to a very prosaic interpretation of the woman in question as any young woman and not a virgin at all. Of course he supposes a widespread mythological notion of a coming deliverer, and it is questionable how far the new view can be used for Christian apologetic. In like manner Gunkel would defend the old reading of Ps. 45:6: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," only understanding it as the courtly address to a prince. Without doubt, this school will give the impression of a reversion to conservative results; substantially it helps inaugurate a period of construction, of a congenial reading one's self into the mind of the past, even if the way is cleared by dynamite.

To conclude, we may note with delight that Old Testament criticism is no longer a "dismal science," but an increasingly fascinating study, full of growth and change.